

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application and claims 1, 13, 16 and 19 are amended. Support for the amendment to claims 1, 13, 16 and 19 can be found on page 2 of the instant specification. Reconsideration of the rejected claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Telephone Interview of May 11, 2007

Applicants appreciate the courtesy extended by the Examiner in the Telephone Interview of May 11, 2007. In the Interview, Applicants expressed a willingness to obtain earlier allowance of the instant application and suggested some possible changes to the claims. Applicants also noted that while the application is pending appeal, Applicants could file an RCE in order to remove the case from appeal and return it to the jurisdiction of the Examiner.

In particular, Applicants suggested amending the claims to recite that the combinational logic comprises logic functions whose outputs depend solely on their inputs and that utilizes logic circuits without memory. The Examiner indicated that such an amendment may likely define over U.S. Patent No. 6,870,929 to GREENE, and agreed to reconsider the anticipation rejection over GREENE if Applicants filed such an amendment and an RCE.

Accordingly, in an effort to advance prosecution and possibly obtain allowance of the instant application, Applicants are herein amending the claims consistent with the Examiner's comments in the Interview.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,870,929 to GREENE.

This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons and arguments already made of record in the Rule 1.116 Response, as well as the Appeal Brief and Reply Brief, which arguments are herein incorporated by reference. Furthermore, Applicants submit that the instant rejection is overcome based on the instant amendment to claims 1, 16 and 19 consistent with the Examiner's comments in the Telephone Interview of May 11, 2007.

Applicants note that while claims 1, 16 and 19 have been amended in an effort to possibly obtain allowance of the instant application, Applicants are not conceding in this application that the claims prior to the instant amendment are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of subject matter which is believed to be allowable. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications."

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the above-noted rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all of the claims are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for

allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below, if needed.

Respectfully submitted,
J. L. CALVIGNAC et al.



Andrew M. Calderon
Reg. No. 38,093

May 15, 2007
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
703-716-1191